

228. (Unamended) A program according to Claim 219, wherein the information processing apparatus is an electronic camera.

229. (Unamended) A program according to Claim 219, wherein the information processing apparatus further instructs the information processing apparatus the perform a storing step of storing the device driver loaded by said loading step in a memory.

REMARKS

Summary

Independent Claims 9, 28, 150, 159, 170, 179, 190, 199, 210, and 219 recite at least one feature not disclosed or suggested by the patent to Mackey. Therefore, is the outstanding rejection of these claims over this patent proper?

Status of the claims

Claims 9, 28, and 150-229 are pending. Claims 9, 28, 150, 159, 170, 179, 190, 199, 210, and 219 are independent.

Requested Action

Applicant respectfully requests the Office to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection in view of the following remarks.

Substantive rejection

Claims 9, 28, and 150-229 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,815,034 (Mackey).

Response to substantive rejection

This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

A. Independent Claims 9, 150, 170, 190, and 210

Independent Claim 150 relates to an information processing apparatus comprising recognition means for recognizing connection of a connected external device to the information processing apparatus and recognizing a device type of the connected external device. The apparatus also comprises read means, responsive to the recognition means recognizing connection of the connected external device to the information processing apparatus and the device type, for reading a device driver for controlling the connected external device either from the connected external device or from a memory area provided in the information processing apparatus.

By this arrangement, unnecessary storing of a device driver for an external device in a memory area in the information processing apparatus can be avoided. In addition, this arrangement permits the newest device driver to be read when a device driver for the connected external device is pre-stored in the memory area of the information processing apparatus, and a newer device driver is stored in the external device. Further, this arrangement also permits the reading of a device driver for an external device from a memory area of the information processing apparatus when no device driver is provided in the external device itself.

In contrast, the patent to Mackey discloses a digital processing system comprising a microprocessor, a RAM, a ROM, and at least one I/O unit. Each I/O unit has a device-specific program therein. The microprocessor is understood to execute the device-specific program to serve as a time-shared controller for each I/O unit. The microprocessor is also understood to always execute the device-specific program provided in the I/O unit such that an incomplete program in the microprocessor may be completed. For this reason, the Mackey patent fails to disclose or suggest a microprocessor that recognizes the connection of the I/O unit to the microprocessor and the type of connected I/O unit, and in response to such recognition reads a device driver for the connected I/O unit from either the connected I/O unit or an internal memory. Therefore, this patent is not understood to disclose or suggest recognition means for recognizing connection of a connected external device to an information processing apparatus and recognizing a device type of the connected external device, as recited by Claim 150. This patent, therefore, also does not disclose or suggest read means, responsive to the recognition means recognizing connection of the connected external device to the information processing apparatus and the device type, for reading a device driver for controlling the connected external device either from the connected external device or from a memory area provided in the information processing apparatus, as also recited by Claim 150.

The failure of this patent to disclose or suggest at least these two features proves fatal to establishing a prima facie case of obviousness against Claim 150, since MPEP §2142, requires that:

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Thus, for this reason, Claim 150 is allowable over the applied art.

And, since Claims 9, 170, 190, and 210 are corresponding apparatus, method, storage medium, and program claims that recite similar features, they are all allowable for similar reasons.

B. Claims 28, 159, 179, 199, and 219

Independent Claim 159 relates to an information processing apparatus comprising recognition means for recognizing connection of a connected external device to the information processing apparatus and recognizing a device type of the connected external device. The apparatus also comprises load means, responsive to the recognition means recognizing the device type, for making a determination whether a device driver for controlling the connected external device is to be loaded from the connected external device and loading the device driver into the information processing apparatus in accordance with the determination.

In contrast, the Mackey patent is not understood to disclose or suggest recognition means for recognizing connection of a connected external device to an information processing apparatus and recognizing a device type of the connected external device, or load means, responsive to the recognition means recognizing the device type, for making a determination whether a device driver for controlling the connected external device is to be loaded from the connected external device and loading the device driver into the information processing apparatus in accordance with the determination, as recited by Claim 159.

The failure of this patent to disclose or suggest at least these two features proves fatal to establishing a prima facie case of obviousness against Claim 159, since MPEP §2142 requires the patent to teach or suggest all the claimed features.

Thus, for this reason, Claim 159 is allowable over the applied art.


And, since Claims 28, 179, 199 and 219 are corresponding apparatus, method, storage medium, and program claims that recite similar features, they are all allowable for similar reasons.

The dependent claims are allowable for the reasons given with respect to the independent claims and because they recite features which are patentable in their own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the claims are now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile No.: (212) 218-2200

DC Main # 78869 v1